

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 14-16, and 18 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-18 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hartmann.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 recites “translating the packet from a first protocol-specific format to a canonical packet format having a fixed length” and “translating the packet from the canonical packet format to a second protocol-specific format”, “wherein the canonical packet format is a generic format that can represent multiple protocol-specific formats”. Hartmann does not teach that a packet is translated from a first protocol-specific format to a canonical packet format, and then from the canonical packet format to a second protocol-specific format. At 3:17-26, Hartmann teaches converting a data packet having the generic packet format to a data packet having an ATM packet format. Hartmann teaches a generic packet format, but the generic packet format is of variable length in order to accommodate multiple formats. Specifically, the source address field, destination address field, and control field have variable lengths, which are specified in the source address length field, destination address length field, and control field length, respectively (Hartmann 14:25-49 and Figure 10). As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-13 and 17 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found, without limitation, in the above-captioned application at page 6, line 20 to page 7, line 8.

Claim 14 recites a system for carrying out the method of claim 1. Therefore, it is believed that claim 14 is also allowable. Claims 15-16 depend from claim 14 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 18 recites program code for carrying out the method of claim 1. Therefore, it is believed that claim 18 is also allowable.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4-4-2008

Clover Huang  
Clover Huang  
Registration No. 55,285  
V 408-973-2594  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014